



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/747,150	12/22/2000	Compbell A. Moore	F-148	9765
919	7590	08/11/2005	EXAMINER	
PITNEY BOWES INC. 35 WATERVIEW DRIVE P.O. BOX 3000 MSC 26-22 SHELTON, CT 06484-8000			COSIMANO, EDWARD R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3639	
DATE MAILED: 08/11/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/747,150	Applicant(s) MOORE ET AL.	
	Examiner Edward R. Cosimano	Art Unit 3639	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 2 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 December 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1. It is noted that the proposed amendments to page 7 and 8 do not conform to the requirements of 37 CFR § 1.121(b)(1)(ii), since the submitted text does not contain the entire text of the paragraph being amended.

2. The use of various trademark(s), for example: "StreamWeaver®", "ADDRESSRIGHT®", "Microsoft®", "Word®", "WordPerfect®", "DocuMatch®", have been noted in this application at paragraph located:

A) at page 2, lines 4-26, "Among the changes and requirements instituted ... printers. Applicant's print stream processing technology, for example, generally known by the trademark StreamWeaver®, substantially ... application-specific programs designed to operate with the document production system.";

B) at page 3, lines 1-10, "The advent of personal computers ... printers. It would be desirable to use such third-party applications in high volume document processing and mail systems such as, for example, the ADDRESSRIGHT® printing system produced by applicant without programmatically altering the third party application to accommodate the printer drivers of the printing system.";

C) between page 6, line 1 and page 7, line 7, "The mailing system 10 is comprised ... an application program, such as, for example, Microsoft® Word® or WordPerfect®, and has mail merge capabilities to produce an address-matched mailing ... to produce a matched mailpiece for placement into the delivery stream.";

D) at page 7, lines 8-13, "It will be understood that the individual components of the mailing system 10 are generic and are generally known in the mailing, document production and addressing arts. Integrated systems such as for example, the DocuMatch® system or ADDRESSRIGHT® system from Pitney Bowes Inc. are known to combine the features and capabilities of several of the components of the mailing system 10.";

E) between page 7, line 14, and page 8, line 30 "Turning now to Fig. 2, a flow chart ... a third-party application such as Microsoft® Word® to produce ... for validity and compliance with USPS regulations. Software such as Pitney Bowes Smart Mailer™ mail management software operates to find duplicate addresses, detect undeliverable addresses and, where possible, corrects the errors in the address as indicated by the

Art Unit: 3639

address correction method step 120. In the ... the formatted document as indicated in the print document method step 128.”;

Any trademarks should be capitalized wherever they appear and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

2.1 Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

A) the following errors have been noted in the specification:

(1) the proposed amendment to page 7, lines 1-11, relative to the originally filed specification would:

(a) create an incomplete paragraph at page 6, lines 1-30, “The mailing system 10 is comprised ... definition file for placement of the destination address, return address,”, since this paragraph would end in an incomplete sentence and with out a final period; and

(b) create a paragraph that would:

(1) create confusion as to whether or not the missing subject matter of the original paragraph located between page 6, line 1 and page 7, line 7, that is the text located at page 6, lines 1-27, “The mailing system 10 is comprised ... document. The print”, is to be deleted from the disclosure or is to remain as part of the disclosure;

(2) begin with an incomplete sentence and in which the first word has not been capitalized;

(3) create a confusing duplication of the text of the specification located at page 6, lines 27-30, “stream processor module also inputs the address information to an envelope formatter 32, which formats the envelope in accordance with information contained in an envelope definition file for placement of the destination address, return address,”, as part of the

replacement paragraph if the text of the disclosure as filed at page 6, lines 1-30, is not to be deleted; and

(4) a confusing transition by deleting the first 4 lines of the text of the paragraph located at page 7, lines 8-13 “It will be understood that the individual components of the mailing system 10 are generic and are generally known in the mailing, document production and addressing arts. Integrated systems such as for example, the DocuMatch® system or ADDRESSRIGHT® system from Pitney Bowes Inc. are known to combine the features and capabilities of several of the components of the mailing system 10.”, and thereby creating an incomplete sentence at page 7, lines 11-13, “... delivery stream. combine the features and capabilities of several of the components of the mailing system 10.”.

(2) the proposed amendment to page 8, lines 1-30, relative to the originally filed specification would:

(a) create an incomplete paragraph at page 7, lines 14-28, “Turning now to Fig. 2, a flow chart ... application. Once the document is processed with the embedded address in step 104, the method moves to step”, since the paragraph would end in an incomplete sentence and without a final period; and

(b) create a paragraph that would:

(1) create confusion as to whether or not the missing subject matter of the first 11 lines of the original paragraph located between page 7, line 14 and page 8, line 30, “Turning now to Fig. 2, a flow chart ... application. Once the mailpiece production is initiated in step 102,”, is to remain as part of the specification or is to be deleted from the specification;

(2) begin with an incomplete sentence and in which the first word has not been capitalized;

(3) create a confusing duplication of the last 5 lines of text from page 7, lines 24-28, "the document is processed with an embedded address as shown in step 104. The address information is typically input from an address database or may be individually inserted in accordance with the third-party word processing application. Once the document is processed with the embedded address in step 104, the method moves to step", if the text of page 7, lines 14-28, is not to be deleted; and

(4) create confusion as to whether or not the missing subject matter of the last 8 lines of original paragraph located between page 7, line 14 and page 8, line 30, "... envelope. The system then moves to the create address image step 124, which provides the destination address, return address or other information, such as barcode, in a format recommended and required by the USPS regulations. The method of the invention then moves to step 126 to print the envelope in accordance with the envelope definition file requirements for placement of the address, postage, barcode and other indicia on the envelope. The method also moves from the document printer method step 116 to print the formatted document as indicated in the print document method step 128.", are to remain as part of the specification or to be deleted from the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

3.1 See appendix A for corrected paragraphs.

4. The specification and drawings have not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification or drawings. Applicant should note the requirements of 37 CFR § 1.52, 37 CFR § 1.74, § 1.75, § 1.84(o,p(5)), § 1.121(b-f).

5. 35 U.S.C. § 101 reads as follows:

"Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title".

5.1 Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the invention as claimed is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

5.1.1 For the purposes of the following analysis it is noted that:

A) in regard to how claims are to be interpreted by the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office when determining whether or not the claims recite statutory subject matter the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (CCPA) which is the predecessor of the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) set forth that "This passage has sometimes been misconstrued as a "rule" or "definition" requiring that all processes, to be patentable, must operate physically upon substances. Such a result misapprehends the nature of the passage quoted as dictum, in its context, and the question being discussed by the author of the opinion. To deduce such a rule from the statement would be contrary to its intendment which was *not to limit* process patentability *but to point out that a process is not limited to the means used in performing it*" and again "the claims are to be given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification during examination of a patent application", and again "We are not persuaded by any sound reason why, at any time before the patent is granted, an applicant should have limitations of the specification read into a claim where no express statement of the limitation is included in the claim.", In re Prater, 56 CCPA 1381, 1395-96, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (1969). Where the broadest reasonable interpretation was latter further defined by the CAFC to be:

(1) different from the way claims are to be interpreted by the Court in infringement suits, In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (The court held that the PTO is not required, in the course of prosecution, to interpret claims in applications in the same manner as a court would interpret claims in an infringement suit. Rather, the "PTO applies to verbiage of the proposed claims the broadest reasonable meaning of the words in their ordinary usage as they would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 3639

art, taking into account whatever enlightenment by way of definitions or otherwise that may be afforded by the written description contained in applicant's specification."); and

(2) limited to "The broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims must also be consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach.", In re Cortright, 165 F.3d 1353, 1359, 49 USPQ2d 1464, 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1999)",

B) further in regard to the nature of statutory subject matter the Supreme Court in Diamond, Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks v. Diehr and Lutton, 209 USPQ 1, 9, (US SupCt, 1981) makes the following statement, "Our earlier opinions lend support to our present conclusion that a claim drawn to subject matter otherwise statutory does not become nonstatutory simply because it uses a mathematical formula, computer program or digital computer.", from this statement it can be seen that the manner in which a process or machine may be implemented or may not be implemented is not a factor that may be used to determine if the claim as a whole recites statutory subject matter.

C) the CCPA further held that "We view the results here as being similar to those in Gelnovatch -- a simulation of something physical is produced by a process akin to mathematical modeling. Each and every step in these claims involves or intimately relates to mathematical operations; we can view the end product in this case only as a mathematical result.", and again "These claims are directed to the process of cross-correlation in the abstract. They are not limited to any particular art or technology, unless pure mathematics is considered as an art or technology. The "signals" processed by the inventions of claims 10-12 may represent either physical quantities or abstract quantities; the claims do not require one or the other. The claims thus dominate the particular method of cross-correlation in any and all arts. They are classic examples of an attempt to embrace the algorithm or scientific truth itself rather than a particular application.", In re Walter, 205 USPQ 397, 409 (CCPA 1980) {emphasis added}.

5.1.2 At this point, it is noted at this point that the CAFC has held in AT & T Corp. v. Excel Communications Inc. 50 USPQ2d 1447 @ 1452 (CAFC 1999) that "[1] In both Alappat and State Street, the claim was for a machine that achieved certain results. In the case before us,

Art Unit: 3639

because Excel does not own or operate the facilities over which its calls are placed, AT & T did not charge Excel with infringement of its apparatus claims, but limited its infringement charge to the specified method or process claims. Whether stated implicitly or explicitly, we consider the scope of Section 101 to be the same regardless of the form -- machine or process -- in which a particular claim is drafted. See, e.g., *In re Alappat*, 33 F.3d at 1581, 31 USPQ2d at 1589 (Rader, J., concurring) ("Judge Rich, with whom I fully concur, reads Alappat's application as claiming a machine. In fact, whether the invention is a process or a machine is irrelevant. The language of the Patent Act itself, as well as Supreme Court rulings, clarifies that Alappat's invention fits comfortably within 35 U.S.C. Section 101 whether viewed as a process or a machine."); *State Street*, 149 F.3d at 1372, 47 USPQ2d at 1600 (" [F]or the purposes of a Section 101 analysis, it is of little relevance whether claim 1 is directed to a 'machine' or a 'process,'"). Furthermore, the Supreme Court's decisions in *Diehr*, *Benson*, and *Flook*, all of which involved method (i.e., process) claims, have provided and supported the principles which we apply to both machine- and process-type claims. Thus, we are comfortable in applying our reasoning in *Alappat* and *State Street* to the method claims at issue in this case." {emphasis added}, hence, both process and machine claims are to be treated the same and not to be treated differently based on the how the claim is drafted.

5.1.3 The instant claims recite a process comprising a series of steps to be performed, (claim 1), which have a disclosed practical application in the technological or useful arts. Further, the instant claims do not merely define either a computer program, a data structure, non-functional descriptive material, (i.e. mere data) or a natural phenomenon.

5.1.4 In regard to claim 1, the invention as set forth in this claim merely describes:

A) at process step (a) using software to create a first data base of addressed matched mail pieces comprising address and textual information as well as control data;

B) at process step (b) sending the data base produced in process step (a) including control codes from one piece of software to another piece of software that implements a print driver in the form of a second data structure or print stream;

C) at process step (c) sending the second data base or print stream to a data base processor module or print stream processor;

Art Unit: 3639

D) at processing step (d) using the data base processing module or print stream processor module to identify what data elements in the second data base or print stream are control data and are address/textual data;

E) at processing step (e) manipulating the second data base to remove the control data from the print stream data;

F) at processing step (f) manipulating the second data base or print stream by parsing the address contained in the second data base from the textual data contained in the second data base or print stream into a third data base of address data and a fourth data base of the remaining textual data and sending the third data base to a correction component and sending the fourth data base to a document printer;

G) at processing step (g) performing the a manipulation of the third data base or address data by determining if each one of the addresses in the third data base is either valid or invalid and where if an address in the third data base is invalid then the invalid address data is manipulated into valid address data; and

H) at processing step (h) manipulating each valid address in the third data base or address data into a fifth data base or IBIP indicia comprising an address image and an indicia image with the intended purpose of potentially being printed.

It is noted that language of these claim does not require that the recited "document printer" and the recited "envelope printer" in fact physically print the textual data or the IBIP image data on any substrate/paper/envelope so as to create one or more items of mail, hence the claimed invention fails to achieve the disclosed practical application and the claim lacks a practical application of the results of the recited manipulations. Therefore, the process as recited in this claim does not require that the result of either the claim as a whole or the manipulations of data as recited in these claims be applied in any manner so as to be tangibly used in a concrete manner and hence to produce a useful concrete and tangible result, that is a concrete and tangible application with in the technological or useful arts.

5.1.5 It is further noted that applicant has not recited in these claims a specific process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, which is either:

A) altered or changed or modified by the invention recited in claims; or

Art Unit: 3639

B) utilizes the result of the invention recited in these claims; or

C) is operated or controlled by the result of the invention recited in these claims.

5.1.6 It is further noted in regard to claim 1, that as claimed applicant has not claimed:

A) pre computer processing, since the claim fails to recited that the data, which originates from an unknown source, is manipulated or transformed/changed before it is processed by the claimed invention; or

B) post computer processing, since the claims fail to recited that the data which represents the result of the claimed manipulation, is neither manipulated nor used nor changed by any device after it has been processed by the claimed invention; or

C) an actual practical use of the claimed invention by any physical system or device or method outside of the claimed invention other than a statement of the intended use of the claimed invention; or

D) process steps or physical acts/operations by the claimed invention that would affect the internal operation of a computer/machine as were found to be statutory in either In re McIlroy 170 USPQ 31 (CCPA, 1971) or In re Waldbaum 173 USPQ 430 (CCPA, 1972); or

E) process steps or physical acts/operations by the claimed invention that would be considered as going beyond the manipulation of “abstract ideas” as were found to be non-statutory in In re Warmerdam 31 USPQ2d 1754 (CAFC, 1994); or

F) a concrete and tangible practical application of either:

(1) the invention as a whole; or

(2) the final results of the manipulations/actions with in the technological or useful arts;

note In re Sarkar 200 USPQ 132 (CCPA, 1978) where the process step of “constructing said obstruction within the actual open channel at the specified adjusted location indicated by the mathematical model” was held to be so tenuous connected to the remaining process steps as to not be a process with in the scope of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Hence, the invention of claim 1 is merely directed to an hypothetical mental exercise that manipulates an abstract idea of process address/textual data without including a process step that would expressly require the manipulated information to be physically used or physically

Art Unit: 3639

implemented as part of the claimed invention and hence is without a claimed concrete and tangible practical application of the abstract idea, (note In re Beauregard 35 USPQ2d 1383 (CAFC 1995) and the associated claims of U.S. Patent 5,710,578; and State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc. 47 USPQ2d 1596 (CAFC 1998)).

5.1.7 It is further noted that the type/nature of either the data or the calculated numbers does not affect the operation of the claimed invention and hence are considered to be non function descriptive material, (note In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

5.1.8 In practical terms, claims define nonstatutory processes if they:

A) consist solely of mathematical operations without some claimed practical application (i.e., executing a “mathematical algorithm”); or

B) simply manipulate abstract ideas, e.g., a bid (Schrader, 22 F.3d at 293-94, 30 USPQ2d at 1458-59) or a bubble hierarchy (Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759),

without some claimed practical application of the mathematics or abstract idea.

5.1.9 In view of the above analysis claim 1, as a whole, are directed to an hypothetical mental exercise that merely manipulates mathematics or an abstract idea without a claimed concrete and tangible practical application of the mathematics or abstract idea, and hence are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR § 1.136(a).

6.1 A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. The following is an Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance:

Art Unit: 3639

A) the prior art, for example:

(1) Linzmayer which discloses that it is advantageous for large mailer to correct/clean their mailing lists in order to save money by reducing undeliverable mail.

(2) either Cordery et al (5,628,249) or Harman et al (5,684,706) or Bresnan et al (5,873,073) or Harvey et al (6,026,385) which discloses that an user may created a single document containing document text, address text and a postage indicia where the document, envelope and postage indicia are printed by separate individual printers. It is noted that Harvey et al (6,026,385) discloses that the created document/file contains all of the required formatting and control codes that are necessary for the printers to properly reproduce the various parts of the document.

B) however, in regard to claims 1 & 2, the prior art does not teach or suggest a process/machine in which the address information that is contained with in the textual information contained with in a print stream is:

(1) identified by removing the control codes from the print stream;

(2) parsed from non-address textual information contained with in the print stream;

(3) processed to identify and correct invalid address information into valid address information;

(4) combined with an IBIP generated indicia to create an electronic image of an envelope.

8. Response to applicant's arguments.

8.1 All rejections and objections of the previous Office action not repeated or modified and repeated here in have been over come by applicant's last response.

8.2 As per the objections, it is noted that applicant failed to address the use of trademarks and the improper amendment generated the new objections, hence, applicant's arguments are non persuasive.

8.3 As per the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection, for the reason given above in the modified rejection, applicant's arguments are non persuasive.

Art Unit: 3639


9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward Cosimano whose telephone number is (571) 272-6802. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:30am to 6:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss, can be reached on (571) 272-6812. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-3600.

9.1 The fax phone number for UNOFFICIAL/DRAFT FAXES is (571) 273-6802.

9.2 The fax phone number for OFFICIAL FAXES is (703) 872-9306 (after 15 July 2005 (571) 273-8300).

9.3 The fax phone number for AFTER FINAL FAXES is (703) 872-9306.

06/30/05


Edward R. Cosimano
Primary Examiner A.U. 3639

APPENDIX A

Please replace the paragraph located at page 1, lines 5-9, with the following paragraph:

Reference is made to [[Application Serial Number _____ (Attorney Docket No. F-139)]] United States Patent No. 6,621,591, entitled METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR PRINTING AN INFORMATION-BASED INDICIA PROGRAM (IBIP) POSTAGE FROM A DOCUMENT INSERTER, assigned to the assignee of this application and filed on even date herewith.”

Please replace the paragraph located between page 6, line 1 and page 7, line 7, with the following paragraph:

The mailing system 10 is comprised of a CPU (central processing unit) 12 with an address database 14 cooperatively connected to a client application 16 and a word processing means, generally designated 18. The word processing means 18 is an application program, such as, for example, Microsoft® Word® or WordPerfect®, and has mail merge capabilities to produce an address-matched mailing wherein a document and envelope have a matched address and/or addressee. The text of the document or documents together with targeted selections or criteria typically is input through the client application 16, and the address database 14 is generally in the form of a mailing list comprised of successive address fields. The address fields are typically parsed and combined by means of the CPU 12, which controls the word processing means 18 software application program and to print or forward each successive document to an application program printer driver interface 20. It will be understood that such word processing means have a master or template document wherein various fields are identified and during the processing mode the specific designated fields, such as the address fields and the addressee name are inserted from a formatted table to produce the desired document. The application program printer driver interface 20 sends all print data to the print stream processor module 28. In the mailing system 10, the address is parsed by the address parsing means 22 which separates the text information from the address information. The address information is checked for accuracy and compliance with USPS formatting regulations by the address validation means 24. If it is determined that the address is not valid, an address correction means 26 corrects the identified defects and forwards the validated address or corrected address as the case may be back to the

Art Unit: 3639

print stream processor module 28. The print stream processor module information is output to a document printer 30 to produce the desired document. The print stream processor module also inputs the address information to an envelope formatter 32, which formats the envelope in accordance with information contained in an envelope definition file 34 for placement of the destination address, return address, barcode, postage or other indicia or image to be printed on the envelope face. The envelope formatted information is passed to the IBIP generator 36 to produce the IBIP postage indicia in accordance with the value indicated by the postage meter 38 and forwards the postage indicia image and address image to the envelope printer 40. The printed envelopes may be fed from the printer 40 to an inserter that inserts documents fed to it from the document printer 30 to produce a matched mailpiece for placement into the delivery stream.”;

Please replace the paragraph located between page 7, line 14 and page 8, line 30, with the following paragraph:

Turning now to Fig. 2, a flow chart showing the method of the present invention for printing an IBIP indicia postage and address in a printing system is illustrated therein. The method of the printing system embodying the invention begins at the “START” step 100. The method then advances to step 102, wherein the mailpiece production is initiated utilizing a third-party application such as Microsoft® Word® to produce an address-matched mailing using the mail merge capabilities of the word processing application. Under the method of the invention, the client application does not need to be programmatically altered because the formatting, control, document setup, page attributes and the like are selected through the third party word processing software application. Once the mailpiece production is initiated in step 102, the document is processed with an embedded address as shown in step 104. The address information is typically input from an address database or may be individually inserted in accordance with the third-party word processing application. Once the document is processed with the embedded address in step 104, the method moves to step 106, wherein the processed document of step 104 is sent to a printer driver as a print stream. The printer driver in step 106 converts the print stream into a document description format and sends it to the print stream processor module in step 107. The print stream processor module in step 107 has means for determining in step 108 which information in the print stream is textual information, and in step 110 which information is

Art Unit: 3639

control code information. The print stream processor module then removes the control code information as indicated in step 112. The address is parsed from the remaining information as indicated in step 114 and the print stream processor module sends the textual information to the document printer as indicated in step 116. The print stream processor module sends the parsed address information to an address validation correction test as shown in step 118. The address is tested for validity and compliance with USPS regulations. Software such as Pitney Bowes Smart Mailer™ mail management software operates to find duplicate addresses, detect undeliverable addresses and, where possible, corrects the errors in the address as indicated by the address correction method step 120. In the valid address method step 118, the ZIP code is also examined and a ZIP+4 code is provided where necessary. The output of the valid address method test step 118 is transmitted to the correction [[or corrected]] address [[from]] from step 120 if step 118 finds an incorrect address. From the address correction method step 120 is output to the document printer method step 116. [[and also]] If step 118 finds a valid address, the output goes to the create indicia image method step 122. In the create indicia image method step 122, the IBIP postage indicia is generated in accordance with the required postage amount for printing on the envelope. The system then moves to the create address image step 124, which provides the destination address, return address or other information, such as barcode, in a format recommended and required by the USPS regulations. The method of the invention then moves to step 126 to print the envelope in accordance with the envelope definition file requirements for placement of the address, postage, barcode and other indicia on the envelope. The method also moves from the document printer method step 116 to print the formatted document as indicated in the print document method step 128.